NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING SERVICE CENTER
Port Hueneme, California 93043-4370

LITERATURE REVIEW OF DURABILITY OF COMPOSITES IN REINFORCED CONCRETE

by

L.J. Malvar

August 1996

19970131 009

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE August 1996	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

LITERATURE REVIEW OF DURABILITY OF COMPOSITES IN REINFORCED CONCRETE

5. FUNDING NUMBERS

6. AUTHOR(S)

L.J. Malvar

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESSE(S)

Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center
1100 23rd Ave.
Port Hueneme, CA 93043-4370

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER

SP-2008-SHR

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESSES

Office of Naval Research
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)

Many fiber reinforced plastics (FRP's) have excellent corrosion resistance properties and can be engineered to have mechanical properties comparable to steel. These characteristics have promoted their use in many structural applications all over the world. Although the short-term mechanical properties of these materials are usually well documented, long-term durability issues still remain. Some of these issues are hereby summarized, mostly for the case of reinforced concrete applications.

Experimental observations indicate that all fiber reinforced plastics have long term strengths which are only a fraction of the short term strength. For glass, aramid and carbon FRP's, the fraction is about 30%, 50% and 80%, respectively. In addition glass and aramid FRP's will degrade if in direct contact with concrete, in the presence of moisture, and when subjected to UV radiation. These poor durability characteristics place significant restrictions on the working stress allowables for design.

14. SUBJECT TERMS

Fiber reinforced plastics, corrosion resistance, reinforced concrete, durability

15. NUMBER OF PAGES
26

16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Excellent mechanical and corrosion resistant characteristics have promoted the use of fiber reinforced plastics (FRP's) in many structural applications [1-5] all over the world [6-10]. Although the short-term mechanical properties of these materials are usually well documented, long-term durability issues still remain. Some of these issues are hereby summarized, mostly for the case of reinforced concrete applications.

BACKGROUND

Recent structural applications of FRP's include :
(a) reinforcing bars for concrete structures, mostly from E-glass fibers embedded in a vinylester of epoxy matrix. Typical composite bar strengths are around 80 to 100 ksi, but the composite modulus of elasticity is only around 6 Msi (versus 29 Msi for steel bars) [11-14]. Aramid, carbon, vinylon as well as hybrid rebars can also be obtained [15-18]
(b) prestressing strands [19-27],
(c) fiberglass sheets to retrofit columns [28],
(d) carbon sheets to retrofit columns, beams and slabs [29-40]
(e) gratings and railings [41]
(f) structural shapes [42]
(g) cables [43]

FIBER TYPES

Current FRP composites for structural applications use mainly three types of continuous fibers: carbon, aramid and glass [1,44]. These are often designed as CFRP, AFRP and GFRP composites, respectively. E-glass fibers are the cheapest (around $0.80 per lb.) and most commonly used [45,46]. They have a tensile modulus of 10.5 Msi and a tensile strength around 500 ksi. S-glass fibers have more desirable properties, e.g. a slightly higher strength and modulus of elasticity, as indicated in Table 1 [44,47] but cost up to 8 times more. Aramid fibers have slightly higher tensile moduli E (between 12 and 27 Msi, with 1 Msi = 10^3 Ksi = 10^6 psi) and similar tensile elongations (between 2 and 4%) [48]. Carbon fibers, however, offer a wide variety of moduli, from 25 to 120 Msi [49-51]. Mesophase pitch fibers have values of E between 100 and 120 Msi but are too expensive for reinforced concrete applications. The most common (such as AS4 and T300, Table 1) have a modulus around 33 Msi and a strength around 550 ksi. Other fibers have been used, such as Vinylon (or polyvinyl alcohol, PVA) [18] and Polyester [43] but in limited applications.

With respect to fiber content, total contents of up to 68% by volume (80% by weight for glass fibers) can be routinely obtained for pultruded uniaxial composites [52]. Contents from 45% to 68% by volume (i.e. 60% to 80% by weight) have been reported [45].

MATRIX TYPES

Epoxies and polyesters are used as the composite matrix for their fiber protection properties. Polyester resins are not very resistant to alkalis and are typically avoided for uses in concrete. Vinylester resins are resistant to a wide range of acids (sulfuric, hydrochloric, hydrofluoric, phosphoric, nitric) as well as to chloride salts and chlorine [44,52] making them ideal for marine environments. For use in concrete, BPA fumarates have shown the best resistance to strong basic solutions [44]. Epoxies can be even more resistant but are somewhat more expensive.

LONG-TERM STRENGTH

Most composites exhibit a long term static strength which is significantly lower than the short term strength. This long term static strength is observed by exposing the material to sustained stress for a long period of time and without any specific adverse environmental exposure (tests typically run in air, indoors, and at ambient temperature). This failure due to the degradation of the material properties with time is also referred to as creep rupture. This loss of strength can be accelerated in adverse environments, such as in the presence of water or strong acidic or alkaline solutions [53]. The observations reported in this section are for long term static strengths without any specific adverse environmental exposure.

For Polystal E-glass tendons, the long term static strength at 10,000 hours (about 1 year) has been reported to be 70% of the short term static strength [3,7]. Sultan et al. [40] report remaining strengths after 10 to 15 years of 40% for hand laid-up fiberglass, and 55% for filament wound composites. Slattery reports that long term tests on Glass/Epoxy composites showed failure of about half of the samples tested at a sustained stress of only 50% of ultimate, after about 7 years [7,54,55]. Some of the samples ruptured at levels as low as 33% of ultimate. Active E-glass composite wraps applied as confinement for some of CALTRANS circular highway columns and pressurized via grout slurry failed after 3 years under sustained stresses around 32% of the manufacturer's reported strength [56]. If the most conservative estimates from these tests are used, it appears that the long term static strength of glass composites can be as low as about 30% of the short term strength.

2

For Kevlar fibers, the 100-year sustained strength is around 60% of short-term strength [7,57]. PARAFIL ropes using the high modulus Aramid fibers limit the long-term (100 year) tensile strength to 50% of the short-term strength [43,58]. This matches tests on Kevlar/Epoxy composites which show a sustained strength of 60% after about 7 years [54,55]. If the most conservative estimate from these tests is used, it appears that the long term static strength of aramid composites can be as low as 50% of the short term strength.

Test data on carbon fibers shows very few failures after several years and a sustained stress of 80% of the short-term ultimate [54].

DESIGN ALLOWABLES VERSUS LONG-TERM STRENGTH

Working stress design is often recommended for concrete members reinforced with commercially available FRP rebars. Most of these use E-glass fibers in a vinylester matrix. The recommended allowable working stress is often 30% to 40% of the ultimate tensile strength [10,59-62], that is around 30 ksi (since most E-glass rebar manufacturers claim short term ultimate strengths from around 80 to 100 ksi). Assuming that no alkali degradation will occur during the structure's life, the recommended working stress is approximately equal to the long term strength for E-glass composites, as indicated previously. Hence the long term design factor of safety is 1. In contrast, if working stress design is used for a grade 60 bar, the allowable stress is limited to 24 ksi. The long term ultimate strength for a typical grade 60 bar (also assuming no corrosion) is about 109 ksi [63]. Hence for a steel bar the long term factor of safety is 4.5 for working stress design. To get a similar safety factor for an E-glass bar, its allowable stress should rather be around 6% to 10% of the measured short term strength, i.e., not more than 10 ksi for a typical 100 ksi nominal strength pultruded E-glass bar. At least one manufacturers [62] recommends limiting sustained stresses to 25% of the tensile strength, and another recommends limiting the allowable working stress to 25% [64]. In the design of fiberglass pipes, the recommended axial tensile design stress is often 25% of ultimate [65].

It should, however, be noted that some conservatism could be built into the measurement of the short term strength of the rebar if standard tensile tests (e.g. ASTM D3916 [66]) are used [67].

To adopt a design allowable stress level, it appears that perhaps a distinction should be made between sustained and transient loads. In reinforced concrete structures, however, the dead load is often a large portion of the total load applied to the structure. Hence a simple limit on the allowable working stress, both for reinforced and poststressed applications may be sufficient.

From the preceding data it is recommended that, in the absence of adverse environmental factors, and until further research is conducted, the allowable working stress for glass FRP rebar should be limited to 20% of the ultimate tensile strength or 20 ksi (as for grade 40 steel rebar), whichever is lower. This would provide some safety with respect to the observed long term strengths of about 30% of the short term ultimate. For glass rebars in concrete, this would apply only if either (1) direct contact with the concrete

3

is prevented, or (2) a pH-neutral concrete is used, or (3) a glass fiber that is really resistant to alkali attack is developed (otherwise the allowable working stress should be lowered).

ALKALI RESISTANCE OF CARBON FIBERS

With regard to environmental interaction, carbon fibers are not affected by moisture, atmosphere, solvents, bases and weak acids [44]. In terms of their specific resistance to alkalis, Judd showed that carbon was resistant to alkaline solutions at all concentrations and all temperatures up to boiling [68]. Carbon tows immersed for 257 days in a very basic 50% w/v sodium hydroxide solution showed variations in strength and elastic modulus only around 15%. Carbon strands soaked for 9 months in a pH 13 solution (at 60°C) showed no variation in strength nor modulus [22,23]. Beams prestressed with carbon strands and subjected to wet/dry cycles in an alkaline solution showed no degradation of flexural strength after 9 months [69].

In summary, carbon fibers have the potential to withstand direct interaction with concrete for long periods of time. In Japan a large amount of the composites used for structural reinforcement utilize carbon fibers [70,71].

ALKALI RESISTANCE OF ARAMID FIBERS

Para-aramid fibers (such as Kevlar) are fairly resistant to many solvents and chemicals, but are affected by strong acids and bases [52]. Kevlar 29 exposed to a 10% sodium hydroxide solution for 1000 hours loses 74% of its strength [48]. Higher modulus Kevlar 49 is much more resistant but still shows some strength loss in an alkaline environment (3% loss in a 40% sodium hydroxide solution after 100 hours).

Due to the protection provided by the resins, aramid composite bars show smaller losses due to exposure to sodium hydroxide solutions: 2% at pH 13 and 90 days (Technora rod) [72], 10% (FiBRA) [73]. The estimated 100-year sustained strength of an aramid rod (Arapree) decreased from 60% in air to 50% of the short-term strength in an alkaline environment [57,74,75]. Separate tests on the same aramid bar showed sustained to short-term strength ratios of 75%, 70%, 60% and 50% for exposures to 20°C air and 20°C, 40°C and 60°C alkaline environments, respectively (at 10,000 hours) [76].

In summary, aramids will show strength decay when in contact with concrete. Higher modulus aramids exhibit better alkali resistance and should be the ones used in such applications.

ALKALI RESISTANCE OF GLASS FIBERS

Glass fibers are chemically vulnerable to many acids and bases and will deteriorate if in direct contact with concrete. In composites, it is generally expected that the matrix

will provide the needed chemical protection for the fibers. However this may not always be the case.

Static fracture of glass fibers

As mentioned earlier, the phenomenon of creep rupture, or static fracture, is the gradual reduction of the tensile strength of glass under stress. This problem is accelerated significantly in the presence of water, acids and alkalis, and may result in sudden cracking of the fibers.

This was emphasized in a paper summarizing the findings from a symposium on durability of glass fiber reinforced concrete: glass fiber composites can exhibit "spontaneous loss over time of much of the flexural and tensile strengths of the composite to little more than that of the matrix" in case of exposure to wet conditions in an alkaline environment [77].

The resins used in the composite must provide a two-fold protection: the matrix toughness must be high enough to prevent the development of microcracks, and diffusion through the matrix must be minimal. Matrix cracking must be prevented to insure adequate fiber protection.

Matrix cracking

Fujii et al. tested E-glass composites with a relatively brittle polyester matrix. These composites showed significant matrix microcracking when loaded to only 40% of their short term ultimate strength [78]. The matrix microcracks effectively allow for direct contact between the fibers and the material in which the composite is embedded (e.g. concrete). This resulted in a significant loss of tensile strength (more than 50% in 720 hours) when the composite was immersed in an acidic solution. The same tests under the same conditions but with a tough vinylester resin resulted in no matrix cracking and no strength loss. Although currently used resins exhibit elongations at failure of up to 4%, tougher resins with elongations of 10% or more can be obtained.

Matrix diffusion

Sen et al. tested 12 beams pretensioned with two 3/8-inch, seven rod fiberglass strands [79,80]. The strands were made of S-2 glass fibers in a Shell Epon 910 epoxy resin, and were stressed at about 50% of short term ultimate. Five beams were precracked (to simulate pile-driving damage) and a total of nine were exposed to simulated tidal cycles in a 15% sodium chloride solution. Three of the five precracked beams failed at a load lower than the cracking load, indicating a total loss of the fiberglass strands after less than 9 months of exposure. One of the uncracked beams failed without the application of any external load (exposure time 18 months). Scanning electron microscope examination of the strands showed the fiber deterioration for the exposed specimens. This total loss of

the strands is a concern, particularly since S-2 glass fibers are more resistant than E-glass fibers to alkalis and the matrix used is also one of the most resistant to basic environments, i.e. since this probably is one of the best glass composites available.

· Scanning electron microscope examination of the strands showed that no matrix cracking was apparent [80]. Damage was attributed to diffusion of the hydroxil ions through the matrix, indicating that, in some cases, even an uncracked matrix of the best type available may not be sufficient to protect the fibers.

Alkaline environment tests on GFRP composites

The Federal Highway Administration sponsored an evaluation of FRP gratings for use in concrete bridge decks [81]. Durability tests in an alkaline environment were conducted on two sets of gratings using E-glass fibers, one set with a polyester matrix, and another with a vinylester matrix. Polyester resins are usually less resistant to alkali attack and showed very rapid deterioration and material loss when compared to the vinylesters. Three-point bending tests on the grating samples after 160 days showed strength reductions of up to about 80% for polyester, and up to about 25% for vinylester. Tests of the gratings embedded in small concrete beam specimens showed significant degradation for both polyester and vinylester gratings, with 30% to 40% loss of ultimate strength after 168-day exposures [81].

Tests by Katsuki et al.. for GFRP rods in a NaOH solution (1 mol/liter at 40°C) showed strength losses of 70% after 120 days [82]. Hou and Martine [83] tested GFRP bars in a basic solution with pH of about 13. They reported losses in flexural strengths of 7% to about 30% for the vinylester bars (depending on the sizing) after 90 days. They also tested polyester bars which showed significantly higher degradation.

Tests at Iowa State University (sponsored in part by the Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center) used accelerated aging techniques to determine the long term strength of GFRP composites [84]. The accelerated aging procedure involved exposing specimens to an alkaline solution at high temperature (up to 140°F) for 2 to 3 months, simulating about 50 years of exposure to real weather. Tensile tests on 3 rebar types indicated remaining strengths of 34% to 52% of the measured short term strengths.

OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Effect of water

Carbon fibers are not affected by water. However the matrix is usually affected, and consequently so are the composite properties. For unidirectional carbon composites this usually translates into a reduction of the compressive and shear strengths, but a small effect on the tensile strength [85]. Graphite composites used as bonded external reinforcement in beams and subjected to 100 freeze-thaw and wet-dry cycles showed little effect on the composite itself, but some loss of the composite-to-concrete adhesion [86].

Para-aramid fibers (such as Kevlar) absorb and are affected by water [10,48,57], mostly at higher temperatures. Saturated aramid composites have been reported to lose 35% of their flexural strength at room temperature [87].

. Glass fibers are also affected by moisture. These effects are summarized in a separate paper [88].

UV effects

Aramids are most vulnerable to ultraviolet (UV) attack. A thin Kevlar 29 fabric exposed to Florida sun for 5 weeks lost 49% of its strength [48]. However, a thick (1/2 inch) rope lost 31% of its strength after 24 months due to the protection of the inner fibers by the outer ones [48].

Resins in general will be affected by UV unless adequate protection is provided by additives or coatings. In turn the composite properties would also be affected, mostly in compression, shear, and transverse tension.

DRAFT CODES IN CANADA AND JAPAN

Both Canada and Japan have issued draft codes for the design of reinforced and prestressed concrete structures [89,90,91].

The Canadian Standards Association is in the process of amending the Canadian Highway Bridge Design Code to include Chapter 16: "Structures with Fibre Reinforcement" [89]. In this chapter, composite applications are limited by fiber type. These limitations are necessary due to the potentials problems described earlier.

GFRP

The use of GFRP was proposed to be restricted as follows:
1. GFRP rod can be the sole primary tensile reinforcement only for barrier walls and for the interior panels of deck slabs of slab-on-girder bridges
2. If GFRP is used as primary tensile reinforcement, then CFRP, AFRP or steel must be used to withstand the unfactored dead loads
3. If GFRP is used as primary shear reinforcement, then CFRP, AFRP or steel must be used to withstand the unfactored dead loads
4. GFRP tendons shall be used only when not in direct contact with concrete
5. GFRC (glass fiber reinforced concrete) shall not be used
6. Maximum permissible stresses in GFRP tendons at transfer are limited to 48% of short-term ultimate
7. GFRP shall be protected against UV rays

Table 2 is reported from the Chapter 16 draft and indicates the permissible, restricted and inadmissible uses of each composite, by application. Table 3 indicates the permissible uses by category.

AFRP

The use of AFRP is restricted as follows:
1. Maximum permissible stresses in AFRP tendons at transfer are limited to 35% of short-term ultimate
2. AFRP shall be protected against UV rays

CFRP

The use of CFRP is restricted as follows:
1. Maximum permissible stresses in CFRP tendons at transfer are limited to 60% of short-term ultimate
2. CFRP with a UV-susceptible matrix shall be protected against UV rays

Proposed allowables for design with FRP bars

To arrive to an allowable design stress the Canadian draft code proposes limiting the factored loads to ϕF times the ultimate strength for FRP rebars. Using the most conservative data presented here, F should be 0.3, 0.5 and 0.8 for GFRP, AFRP and CFRP, respectively (Table 4, Proposed F). For ratios of dead load to live load greater than 2, the Canadian draft code suggests values of F of 0.7, 0.5 and 0.9. For mostly live load, these values are shown as 0.6, 0.45, and 0.8. It is estimated that the value for GFRP may be too liberal, given the failure studies previously mentioned (hence 0.3 is suggested). The Japanese code suggests a corresponding factor β_3 of 0.7 for all three FRP types [91].

The Canadian draft code also proposes a resistance factor ϕ of 0.9. This resistance factor is a function of the variability of the rebar strength. This seems also liberal since (1) tests on some of these rebars have shown coefficients of variation in strength in excess of 20% [14,67], and (2) the product ϕF provides a very low safety factor when compared to working stress design with steel rebars. The Japanese draft code [89,90] recommends ϕ factors of 0.77 for glass, 0.87 otherwise. Hence it is proposed that ϕ could be taken around 0.7 (Table 4).

From the preceding, it is proposed that the ϕF ratio of allowable stress to ultimate strength could be chosen as 0.2, 0.35 and 0.6 for GFRP, AFRP and CFRP, respectively (Table 4).

For tendons, the stresses at transfer, which would be long term sustained stresses, could be limited to similar values. Further limits at jacking and ultimate should be determined, which is beyond the scope of this work.

DEVELOPMENT OF NAVY POLICY

At completion time of this report not much design criteria was available for use of FRP materials in Navy construction.

Military Handbook 1025/1 for Piers and Wharfs stated that: "these are fairly new materials ... and due caution should be exercised in their selection and usage" (section 4.2.6 - Plastics) [92].

NAVFAC design policy letter DPL-93-002 stated: "It is the policy of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command not to specify use of unproven and/or innovative materials in Navy on-shore engineering, design, and construction projects" [93]. However, the letter also indicated that a waiver to the policy could be obtained from the Chief Engineer's Office for the use of FRP components. Navy support for the development of design criteria for FRP components is expected in the near future, and design policy letter DPL-93-002 will be superseded.

CONCLUSIONS

Durability issues of some currently available FRP products limit their use for some structural applications. Long term strength in the absence of detrimental environmental factors have been measured which are well below the short term strengths. The presence of water, acids, alkalis, and UV, can further reduce the long term strengths significantly. The following recommendations are only suggested interim guidelines until formal design criteria is developed. Further limitations may be necessary for allowable stresses and usage.

The use of GFRP composites should be very restricted when in direct contact with concrete, at least until further durability guarantees are provided. It is recommended that:
- GFRP tendons should not be used in direct contact with concrete;
- GFRP tendons permissible stresses at transfer should be limited to 20 ksi or 20% of the measured ultimate tensile strength, whichever is less;
- GFRP bars designs should use allowable working stresses of 20 ksi or 20% of the measured ultimate tensile strength, whichever is less;
- GFRP bars and tendons should not be used as the sole primary reinforcement, except in applications where the reinforcement is not subjected to sustained load, such as barrier walls;
- GFRP reinforcements should be permitted for secondary reinforcement, such as column transverse reinforcement and passive column wraps;
- GFRP reinforcements should be protected against moisture and UV.

The use of aramid composites should be allowed with some restrictions, such as:

- AFRP tendons permissible stresses at transfer (and allowable working stresses for bars) should be limited to 35 % of the measured ultimate tensile strength;
- AFRP reinforcements should be protected against moisture and UV;
- High modulus AFRP reinforcements are recommended for exposure to concrete due to their higher alkali resistance.

The use of carbon composites should be allowed with some restrictions, such as:

- CFRP tendons permissible stresses at transfer (and allowable working stresses for bars) should be limited to 60 % of the measured ultimate tensile strength;
- CFRP reinforcements should be protected against moisture and UV.

Whenever possible, the use of pH-neutral concretes is strongly recommended to prevent alkali degradation.

REFERENCES

1. Erki, M.A., Rizkalla, S.H., "FRP Reinforcement for Concrete Structures," Concrete International, Vol. 15, No. 6, June 1993, pp. 48-53.

2. Saadatmanesh, H., Ehsani, M.R., "Application of Fiber-Composites in Civil Engineering," Structural Materials, Proceedings, Structures Congress 1989, ASCE, San Francisco, May 1989 (Orofino, J.F., ed.). pp. 526-535.

3. Wolff, R., Miesseler, H-J., "New Materials for Prestressing and Monitoring Heavy Structures," Concrete International, vol. 11, no. 9, September 1989, pp. 86-89.

4. Miesseler, H.-J., Wolff, R., "Experience with Fiber Composite Materials and Monitoring with Optical Fiber Sensors," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 167-181.

5. Ballinger, C.A., "Development of Composites for Civil Engineering," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 288-301.

6. Sonobe, Y., "Outline of the National Research Project on the Use of FRP Reinforcement in Concrete Building Structures in Japan," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, Intl. Symposium, ACI SP-138, A. Nanni and C.W. Dolan editors, 1993, pp. 695-713.

7. Taerwe, L., "FRP Developments and Applications in Europe," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 99-114.

8. Sonobe, Y., "An Overview of R&D in Japan," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 115-128.

9. Erki, M.A., Rizkalla, S.H., "A Canadian Perspective on R&D, Design/Codes and Technical Committees," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 89-98.

10. Dolan, C., "FRP Development in the United States," Fiber- Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, 1993, pp. 129-163.

11. Larralde, J., Renbaum, L., and Morsi, A., "Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic Rebars in Lieu of Steel Rebars," Structural Materials, Proceedings, Structures Congress 1989, ASCE, San Francisco, May 1989 (Orofino, J.F., ed.), pp. 261-269.

12. Porter, M.L., and Barnes, B.A., "Tensile Testing of Glass Fiber Composite Rod," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 123-131.

13. Wines, J.C., and Hoff, G.C., "Laboratory Investigation of Plastic-Glass Fiber Reinforcement for Reinforced and Prestressed Concrete," Report 1, U.S. Army Engineering Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Mississippi, February 1966.

14. Malvar, L.J., "Tensile and Bond Properties of GFRP Reinforcing Bars," ACI Materials Journal, vol. 92, no. 3, May-June 1995, pp. 276-285.

15. Kakihara, R., Kamiyoshi, M., Kumagai, S., and Noritake, K., "A New Aramid Rod for the Reinforcement of Prestressed Concrete Structures," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 132-142.

16. Kaiser, M., "Composite Rebar enters Commercial Production," Reinforced Plastics, April 1995, p. 4

17. Petrina, P., White, R.N., "Laminated Composite Reinforcing for Concrete Structures," Proceedings, 10th ASCE Engineering Mechanics Conference, Boulder, CO, May 1995, pp. 118-121.

18. Okazaki, M., "Properties and Applications of Vinylon FRP Rod (CLATEC Rod)", Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 189-222.

19. Dolan, C.W., "Developments in Non-Metallic Prestressing Tendons," PCI Journal, Sept-Oct 1990, pp. 80-88.

20. Rostasi, F.S., and Budelmann, H., "FRP Tendons for the Post- Tensioning of Concrete Structures," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 155-166.

21. Sen, R., Iyer, S., Issa, M., Shahawy, M., "Fiberglass Pretensioned Piles for Marine Environment," Proceedings of the Conference on Advanced Composite Materials in Civil Engineering Structures, ASCE, Las Vegas, Nevada, 1991, pp. 348-359.

22. Santoh, N., "CFCC (Carbon Fiber Composite Cable)," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 223-247.

23. Santoh, N., Kimura, H., Enomoto, T., Kiuchi, and T., Kuzuba, Y., "Report on the Use of CFCC in Prestressed Concrete Bridges in Japan," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, Intl. Symposium, ACI SP-138, A. Nanni and C.W. Dolan editors, 1993, pp. 895-911.

24. Warren, G.E., Malvar, L.J., Inaba, C., Hoy, D., "Rehabilitating the Navy's Waterfront Infrastructure," Ports 95, 7th Conference on Port Engineering and Development for the 21st Century, Tampa, FL, Vol. 2, March 1995, pp. 1158-1169.

25. Iyer, S.L., "Advanced Composite Demonstration Bridge Deck," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, International Symposium, ACI SP-138, A. Nanni and C.W. Dolan editors, 1993, pp. 831-852.

26. Iyer, S.L., and Sivakumar, R., "Graphite Prestressed Piles and Fiberglass Prestressed Pilecaps for U.S. Navy Pier in California," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods for Repair, 3rd Materials Engineering Conference (K. Basham, ed.), San Diego, CA, November 1994, pp. 392-399.

27. Iyer, S.L., Ranganathan, V., and Bagby, R., "Graphite Prestressed Concrete Deck for Navy Facilities," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods for Repair, 3rd Materials Engineering Conference (K. Basham, ed.), San Diego, CA, November 1994, pp. 400-407.

28. Fyfe, E.R., "Testing and Field Performance of the High Strength Fiber Wrapping System," Restructuring; America and Beyond, Proceedings of the XIII Structures Congress (M. Sanayei, ed.), Boston, MA, April 2-5 1995, pp. 603-606.

29. Meier, U., Deuring. M., Meier, H., and Schwegler, G., "Strengthening of Structures with CFRP Laminates: Research and Applications in Switzerland," Advanced Composite Materials in Bridges and Structures, First International Conference, K.W. Neale and P. Labossiere eds., Quebec, Canada, 1992, pp. 243-251.

30. Obayashi Corp./Mitsubishi Kasei, "Carbon Fiber Reinforced Earthquake-Resistant Retrofitting," Technical Data Sheet, Tokyo, Japan, 1993.

31. Inaba, C.M., Warren, G.E., Malvar, L.J., "Upgrade of Navy Piers with Composites," 41st International SAMPE Symposium and Exhibition, Society for the Advancement of Material and Process Engineering, March 1996, Anaheim, CA.

32. Inaba, C.M., Warren, G.E., Malvar, L.J., "Rehabilitation of Navy Pier Decks with Composite Sheets," First International Conference on Composites in the Infrastructure, ICCI 96, Tucson, AZ, January 1996.

33. Malvar, L.J., Warren, G.E., Inaba, C., "Rehabilitation of Navy Pier Beams With Composite Sheets," Second FRP International Symposium, Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures, Gent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 533-540.

34. Finch, W.W., Chajes, M.J., Mertz, D.R., Kaliakin, V.N., Faquiri, A., "Bridge Rehabilitation using Composite Materials," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods of Repair, Third Materials Engineering Conference, San Diego, CA, November 1994, K. Basham editor, pp. 1140-1147.

35. Priestley, M.J.N., Seible, F., Fyfe, E., "Column Seismic Retrofit using Fibreglass Epoxy Jackets," Advanced Composite Materials in Bridges and Structures, First International Conference, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, 1992, pp. 287-298.

36. Saadatmanesh, H., Ehsani, M.R., Li, M.W., "Strength and Ductility of Concrete Columns Externally Reinforced with Fiber Composite Straps," ACI Structural Journal, Vol. 91, No. 4, July-August 1994, pp. 434-447.

37. Ma, G., "Bridge Retrofit with CF Reinforced Materials," High-Performance Composites for Civil Engineering Applications, SAMPE Regional Seminar, La Jolla, CA, September 1993.

38. Kliger, H., "A New Reinforced Fiber Sheet Material for Repair of Civil Engineering Concrete Structures," High-Performance Composites for Civil Engineering Applications, SAMPE Regional Seminar, La Jolla, CA, September 1993.

39. Howie, I., Karbhari, V.M., "Effect of Materials Architecture on Strengthening Efficiency of Composite Wraps for Deteriorating Columns in the North-East," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods of Repair, Proceedings of the Third Materials Engineering Conference (K. Basham, ed.), San Diego, CA, November 13-16, 1994, pp. 199-206.

40. Sultan, M., Hawkins, G., Sheng, L-H., "CALTRANS Program for the Evaluation of Fiber Reinforced Plastics for Seismic Retrofit and Rehabilitation of Structures," Proceedings, FHWA National Seismic Conference, San Diego, CA, Dec. 1995.

41. Warren, G.E., Malvar, L.J., Inaba, C., Hoy, D., Mack, K., "Navy Advanced Waterfront Technology," Intl. Conference on Corrosion and Corrosion Protection of Steel in Concrete, University of Sheffield, U.K., July 1994, pp. 1310-1319.

42. Mossalam, A., Bank, L., "Short-term Behavior of Pultruded Fiber-Reinforced Plastic Frame," Journal of Structural Engineering, Vol. 118, No. 7, July 1992, pp. 1937-1954.

43. Burgoyne, C.J., "PARAFIL Ropes for Prestressing Applications," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 333-351.

44. ASM International, Engineered Materials Handbook, Volume 1: Composites, Metals Park, OH, November 1987.

45. Bayer A.G., Polystal Data Sheet, Germany, 1991.

46. Owens/Corning Fiberglas Co., E-Glass Product Data Sheet, Granville, OH, 1992.

47. Owens/Corning Fiberglas Co., S-2 Glass Data Sheet, Granville, OH, 1992.

48. duPont de Nemours & Co., Kevlar Data Sheet, Wilmington, DE, 1992.

49. Hercules Advanced Materials and Systems Co., AS4C Product Data Sheet, Composite Products Group, UT, 1992.

50. Amoco Performance Products, Inc., Thornel Product Information, Technical Leaflet, 1991.

51. Mitsubishi Kasei Corporation, DIALED Technical Information Sheet, Tokyo, Japan, and Menlo Park, CA., 1993.

52. ASM International, Engineered Materials Handbook, Volume 2: Engineering Plastics, Metals Park, OH, November 1988.

53. Harris, B., Developments in GRP Technology 1, Applied Science Publishers, NY, 1983.

54. Slattery, K., "Mechanistic Model of the Creep-Rupture Process in Filamentary Composites," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods of Repair, Proceedings, Third Materials Engineering Conference, San Diego, CA, November 1994, pp. 215-222.

55. Toland, R.H., Chiao, T.T., "Stress-Rupture life of Kevlar Epoxy Spherical Pressure Vessels," UCID-17755, Part 2, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, CA, 1978.

56. Hawkins, G.F., Patel, N.R., Steckel, G.I., Sultan, M., "Failure Analysis of Highway Bridge Column Composite Overwraps," Fiber Composites in Infrastructure, First intl. Conference on Composites in Infrastructure, ICCI 96, Tucson, AZ, January 1996.

57. Horn, M.H., Riewald, P.G., Zweben, C.H., "Strength and Durability Characteristics of Ropes and Cables from Kevlar Aramid Fibers," Oceans' 77 Conference Record, Third

Combined Conference sponsored by the Marine Technology Society and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, October 1977, pp. 24E1-24E12.

58. PARAFIL Ropes: Technical Note PF2, Linear Composites Limited, West Yorkshire, England.

59. Polystructures, Inc., PSI Fiberbar Applications, Data Sheet. Little Rock, AR, 1991.

60. International Grating, Inc., Kodiak - Fiberglass Reinforced Plastic Rebar. Houston, TX, 1988.

61. Hughes Brothers, Corrosion Proof Fiber Reinforced Plastic Rebar, Magnum Series 9000. Tequesta, FL, 1995.

62. Marshall Industries Composites Inc., C-Bar, Technical Leaflet, 1996.

63. Mirza, S.A., MacGregor, J.G., "Variability of Mechanical Properties of Reinforcing Bars," Journal of the Structural Division, ASCE Proceedings, Vol. 105, No. ST5, May 1979.

64. Imco Reinforced Plastics Inc., Rebar Data Sheet, Moorestown, NJ, 1995.

65. The Composites Institute of the Society of the Plastics Industry Inc., Fiberglass Pipe Handbook, NY, 1992.

66. ASTM D3916, "Test Method for Tensile Properties of Pultruded Glass Fiber Reinforced Plastic Rod," Annual book of ASTM Standards, Vol. 08.03, 1991.

67. Malvar, L.J., Bish, J., "Grip Effects in Tensile Testing of FRP Bars," Second FRP International Symposium, Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures Gent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 108-115.

68. Judd, N.C.W., "The Chemical Resistance of Carbon Fibers and a Carbon Fibre/Polyester Composite," Proceedings, First International Conference on Carbon Fibres, Plastics Institute, 1971, p. 32/1-32/8.

69. Arockiasamy, M., Zhuang, M., Sandepudi, K., "Durability Studies on Prestressed Concrete Beams with CFRP Tendons," Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures, FRPCS-2, Ghent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 456-462.

70. Machida, A., State-of-the-Art Report on Continuous Fiber Reinforcing Materials, Concrete Engineering Series, 3, Research Committee on Continuous Fiber Reinforcing Materials, Japan Society of Civil Engineers, October, 1993, 164 pp.

71. Yamasaki, Y., Masuda, Y., Tanano, H., Shimizu, A., "Fundamental Properties of Continuous Fiber Bars," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, International Symposium, ACI SP-138, 1993, pp. 715-730.

72. Noritake, K., Kakihara, R., Kumagai, S., Mizutani, J., "Technora, an Aramid FRP Rod," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 267-290.

73. Tamura, T., "FiBRA," Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic (FRP) Reinforcement for Concrete Structures: Properties and Applications, Developments in Civil Engineering, 42, A. Nanni editor, Elsevier Science Publishers, 1993, pp. 291-303.

74. Gerritse, A., "Durability Criteria for Non-Metallic Tendons in Alkaline Environment," Advanced Composite Materials in Bridges and Structures, First International Conference, K.W. Neale and P. Labossiere eds., Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, 1992, pp. 129-137.

75. Gerritse, A., Den Uijl, J.A., "Long Term Behavior of Arapree," Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures, FRPCS-2, Ghent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 57-66.

76. Scheibe, M., Rostasy, F.S., "Stress-Rupture of AFRP Subjected to Alkaline Solutions and Elevated Temperature - Experiments," Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures, FRPCS-2, Ghent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 67-73.

77. Diamond, S., "A Summary and Retrospective of the Symposium on Durability of GFRC," Proceedings, Durability of Glass Fiber Reinforced Concrete Symposium, Prestressed Concrete Institute, Chicago, IL, November 1985, pp. 352-356.

78. Fujii, Y., Maekawa, Z., Hamada, H., Kubota, T., Murakami, A., Yoshiki, T., "Evaluation of Initial Damage and Stress Corrosion of GFRP", Vol. 5: Composites Behavior, Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Composite Materials (ICCM/9), Madrid, Spain, 12-16 July 1993, pp. 562-568.

79. Sen, R., Mariscal, D., Issa, M., Shahawy, M., "Durability and Ductility of Advanced Composites," Structural Engineering in Natural Hazards Mitigation, Vol. 2, Proceedings of the 1993 Structures Congress, ASCE, Irvine, CA, 19-21 April 1993, pp. 1373-1378.

80. Sen, R., Mariscal, D., Shahawy, M., "Investigation of S-2 Glass/Epoxy Strands in Concrete", Fiber-Reinforced-Plastic Reinforcement for Concrete Structures, International Symposium, ACI SP-138, 1993, pp. 15-33.

81. Anderson, G., Bank, L., Munley, E., "Durability of Concrete Reinforced with Pultruded Fiber Reinforced Concrete Grating," Session 2-B, 49th Annual Conference, Composites Institute, The Society of the Plastics Industry, Cincinnati, OH, February 1994, pp. 1-7.

82. Katsuki, F., Uomoto, T., "Prediction of Deterioration of FRP Rods due to Alkali Attack," Non-Metallic (FRP) Reinforcements for Concrete Structures, FRPCS-2, Ghent, Belgium, August 1995, pp. 82-89.

83. Hou, Y., Martine, E.A., "Alkali Resistance of Pultruded Bars," Technical Session on Durability of FRP Reinforcement in Concrete, 1996 ACI Spring Convention, Denver, CO, March 1996.

84. Porter, M.L., Mehus, J., Young, K.A., O'Neil, E.F., Barnes, B.A., "Aging Degradation of Fiber Composite Reinforcements for Structural Concrete," Technical Session on Durability of FRP Reinforcement in Concrete, 1996 ACI Spring Convention, Denver, CO, March 1996 (Also in: Porter, M.L., Mehus, J., Young, K.A., "Aging Degradation of Fiber Composite Reinforcements for Structural Concrete," Final Report, Iowa State University, Engineering Research Institute, September 1995, 214 pp.).

85. Ciriscioli, P.R., Lee, W.I., Peterson, D.G., Springer, G.S., Tang, J.M., "Accelerated Environmental Testing of Composites," Environmental Effects on Composite Materials, Vol. 3, edited by G.S. Springer, Technomic Publishing Co., Lancaster, PA, 1988, pp. 35-50.

86. Chajes, M.J., Mertz, D.R., Thomson, T.A., Farschman, C.A., "Durability of Composite Material Reinforcement," Infrastructure: New Materials and Methods for Repair, 3rd Materials Engineering Conference (K. Basham, ed.), San Diego, CA, pp. 598-605.

87. Allred, R.E., "The Effect of Temperature and Moisture Content on the Flexural Response of Kevlar/Epoxy Laminates: Part I [0/90] Filament Orientation," Environmental Effects on Composite Materials, Vol. 2, edited by G.S. Springer, Technomic Publishing Co., Lancaster, PA, 1984, pp. 27-42.

88. Novinson, T., Hoy, D., "State-of-the-Art Report on Composites in Ocean Front Environment", Technical Memorandum, Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center, Port Hueneme, CA, in preparation.

89. Canadian Standards Association, Draft Chapter 16: "Fibre Reinforced Structures" and Commentary, Canadian Highway Bridge Design, February and October 1995.

90. Japanese Ministry of Construction, Building Research Institute, "Guidelines for Structural Design of FRP Reinforced Concrete Building Structures," Draft, FRP Reinforced Concrete Research Group, July 1995.

91. Japanese Ministry of Construction, Building Research Institute, "Design Guidelines for FRP Prestressed Concrete Members," Draft, FRP Reinforced Concrete Research Group, July 1995.

92. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Military Handbook 1025/1, Piers and Wharfs, 1995.

93. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, NAVFAC design policy letter DPL-93-002, Code 04B, 02 April 1993.

Table 1 - Material Properties

Material	Tensile Modulus Msi (GPa)	Ultimate Stress ksi (MPa)	Ultimate Strain (%)	Reference	Approximate Cost ($/lb)
E-glass	10.5 (72)	500 (3450)	4.8	[44, 46]	0.8
S-glass	12.5 (86)	665 (4590)	5.7	[44, 47]	6
Kevlar 29 (aramid)	9.0 (62)	400 (2760)	4.0	[48]	14
Kevlar 49 (aramid)	18.0 (124)	525 (3620)	2.5	[48]	18
AS4C (carbon)	33.0 (227)	560 (3860)	1.6	[49]	12
T-300 (carbon)	33.5 (231)	530 (3660)	1.4	[50]	12
P-100 (carbon)	100 (690)	350 (2410)	0.32	[44,50]	800
P-120 (carbon)	120 (828)	325 (2240)	0.27	[44,50]	850
Leadline (carbon) K13B2U/4U	120 (828)	570 (3930)	0.48	[51]	-
Vinylester (resin)	0.52 (3.6)	12 (83)	4.0	[44, 52]	-
Resilient Vinylester	0.46 (3.2)	11 (76)	10.0	[52]	-

Table 2 - Conditions of use for FRP tendons and primary reinforcement based on durability considerations. (from Chapter 16, Canadian highway bridge design code, October 1995)

COMPOSITE TYPE	APPLICATION				Slab bridges	Stress-	Barrier
	Prestressed beams and slabs			Ungrouted external	Deck slabs	laminated wood deck	walls
	Pre-tensioned	Post-tensioned					
		Grouted	Ungrouted				
GFRP	I	I	P	P	I	P	P
CFRP	P	P	P	P	P	I	P
AFRP	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

I inadmissible
P permissible

21

Table 3 - Summary of permitted uses of FRP (based on durability considerations) (from Chapter 16, Canadian highway bridge design code, October 1995)

COMPOSITE	CATEGORIES OF USE				
	Primary Tensile Reinforcement	Secondary Reinforcement	Shear Reinforcement	Primary Compression Reinforcement	Tendons
AFRP	P	P	P	I	P
GFRP	R	P	R	I	R
CFRP	P	P	P	I	P

I - inadmissible
P - permissible
R - permissible with restrictions

22

Table 4. Proposed Allowable to Ultimate Stress Ratio ϕF for FRP Rebar Design.

FACTOR	ORIGIN	GFRP	AFRP	CFRP
F	Canadian draft, $R \geq 2$	0.7	0.5	0.9
	Canadian draft, $R \rightarrow \infty$	0.6	0.45	0.75
	Japanese draft, tendons, β_3	0.7	0.7	0.7
	Proposed	0.3	0.5	0.8
ϕ	Canadian draft	0.9	0.9	0.9
	Japanese draft	0.77	0.87	0.87
	Proposed	0.67	0.7	0.67
ϕF ratio	Canadian draft, $R \geq 2$	0.63	0.45	0.81
	Japanese draft	0.54	0.61	0.61
	Proposed	0.2	0.35	0.6